
Case 3:08-cv-00138-WQH-POR Document 32

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA



NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

ТО	E THE DISTRIC	CT JUDGE / U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Hayes	
FR	OM: <u>C Puttmann</u> ,	Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 3/28/2008	
CASE NO.: 08cv138 WOH POR DOCUMENT FILED BY: Plaintiff			
CASE TITLE: Schneider Rucinski Enterprises v. Touch Asia Outsourcing Solutions, Inc. Et al			
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Plaintiff's Request for Ex Parte Application for Hearing Memorandum			
Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:			
1	Local Rule	Discrepancy	
	5.1 ,	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation	
	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper	
ō	5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.	
V	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely	
	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document	
	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions	
	7.1	Missing table of contents	
	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself	
	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order	
		Supplemental documents require court order	
		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest	
		<u>OTHER</u>	
		Date forwarded: 4/1/2008 ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:			
X	The document is to	be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.	
	The document is N copy of this order of	OT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a on all parties.	
	Rejected document	jected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers	
	Counsel is advised to Local Rule 83.1	ounsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursua	
		CHAMBERS OF: WOH	
	Dated: 4/3/08	By: _ RB7	
	cc: All Parties		